REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-30 remain in this application. Claims 1, 11, and 21 have been amended.

In the Specification

The specification is objected to for the informality claimed on page 3, paragraph [0005], wherein "Inasmuch" is defined. The Office Action suggest that spacing in needed between the words. Applicant respectfully traverses, the word "Inasmuch" is defined and spelled correctly with no spacing, as show in Merriam Webster's Dictionary. Applicant respectfully request withdrawal of this objection.

In the Claims

Claims 1-30 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Johnston-Watt et al (US Publication No. 2003/0115311). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claims 1, 11, and 21 have been amended to further clarify the claimed invention. More specifically, claim 1 provides "*A provisioning system for supporting presence applications, comprising:*
an ontology depository having at least one domain-specific ontology model <u>accessible via the Internet</u> for a particular presence application; and
a presence entity having a structure operable to reference a domain-specific ontology model of said ontology depository <u>via the Internet</u> for customizing a presence client software module associated with said presence entity, whereby said presence entity becomes operable to engage in a particular presence application relating to said domain-specific ontology model."
Independent claims 11 and 21 have also been amended to include similar language.

Clearly, Johnston-Watt introduces the idea of using an ontology to customize a presence system. What Johnston-Watt does not disclose is the idea of the ontology being located at some remote location in the Internet and the presence system using a reference to find that location. This may seem like a small point, but it is not.

By way of comparison, before the World Wide Web there was a booming new technology called multimedia compact disks. The web pretty-much brought multimedia disks to an end. If you will recall, a page on a multimedia disk looked a lot like a web page. It had text, pictures, animations, audio, and hypertext links. A hypertext link was a highlighted word. One would click on the highlighted word and it would take the user to another page. The difference between a multimedia disk and a web page is that when one would click on a hypertext link on a multimedia disk, it takes the user to another page on the same disk, but when one would click on a hypertext link on a web page, it takes the user to another web page possibly anywhere in the

world. This is analogous to the difference between having the ontology in the presence system and having the ontology somewhere on the Internet.

Another important reason for having the ontology somewhere on the Internet is because presence systems have several components. There are at least three; a part that collects and transmits presence information, a part that processes presence information, and a part that receives presence information and presents it to the user. If the ontology is inside the presence system, all three parts must be from the same vendor. This is like saying a web server and a web browser must be from the same vendor.

For example, as can be seen in the present application at paragraph 0026:

[0026] A presence client module (not shown in this FIG.)
associated with the sending system 304 is not
designed specifically for any particular
presence service application (e.g., a transportation
system application, a security monitoring system
application, and the like), but is customizable
to become an application-specific presence client
by referencing a domain-specific ontology model
deposed at the ontology depository 310 via a
reference path 308A."

In the present application at figure 3A, the reference 308A is an arrow passing through a communications network cloud.

Figure 3 of Johnston-Watt shows the "Rule Database" inside the "Application Adaptor Framework." This can only be interpreted to mean that the ontology is inside the presence system.

Claims 2-10, 12-20, and 22-30 depends from and further limits, in a patentable sense, independent claims 1, 11, and 21, respectively, and, hence, are also submitted to be in condition for allowance.

It is believed that the foregoing amendment places the Application in condition for allowance; therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-30, and full allowance of same.

Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned to expeditiously resolve any outstanding issues.

Respectfully submitted,

ALCATEL LUCENT

Dated: April 2, 2007

/Bobby D.Slaton/
Bobby D. Slaton
Reg. No. 43,130

Alcatel Lucent
Intellectual Property Department
3400 W. Plano Parkway, M/S LEGL2
Plano, TX 75075
Phone: (972) 477-1497
Fax: (972) 477-9328